UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,665	09/15/2000	Gregory L. Slaughter	5181-47300	2188

7590 01/26/2007

Robert C Kowert
Conley Rose & Tayon P C
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER	
ZHEN, LI B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/663,665	SLAUGHTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Li B. Zhen	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 December 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-22,24-43 and 45-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-22,24-43 and 45-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-22, 24-43 and 45-53 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, filed 14 December 2006, with respect to the claims have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Final Rejection of 18 October 2006 has been withdrawn and prosecution is hereby reopened.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 3-22, 24-43 and 45-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,851,089 to Erickson et al. [hereinafter Erickson] in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,171 to Baentsch et al. [hereinafter Baentsch].

6. As to claim 1, Erickson teaches the invention substantially as claim including a method for the exchange of objects in a distributed computing environment [col. 25, line 57 – col. 26, line 14], comprising:

user accessing a client device [col. 7, lines 1 – 16]; and

generating a computer programming language object from a data representation language representation of the object [a wrapper file has been created and stored, the wrapper file can be read by a wrapper builder application and deserialized, by known methods, to reproduce the objects that the wrapper comprises; col. 26, lines 20 – 30], wherein the object is an instance of a class in the computer programming language [wrapper builder application employs serialization to encode an internal object representation of a wrapper into XML format; col. 26, lines 16 - 20], and wherein the object is accessible for use during the accessing the client device [wrapper serialization component 1170 provides for the storage and retrieval of wrappers in XML (Extensible Markup Language) through the process of Object Serialization; col. 25, line 59 - col. 26, line 13], and the client device receiving a message [XML data can be saved as a wrapper file; col. 26, lines 15-20] in the data representation language [wrapper serialization component 1170 implements the functionality by which wrappers are stored

and retrieved, called serialization; col. 20, lines 22-48], wherein the message includes the data representation language representation of the object [XML format; col. 26, lines 15 – 20]. Although Erickson teaches the invention substantially as claimed, Erickson does not teach receiving a message from a service device and deleting the computer programming language object in response to the terminating access.

However, Baentsch teaches a client device receiving a message in the data representation language from a service device in the distributed computing environment [col. 7, lines 46 – 50] prior to the generating a computer programming language object [col. 8, lines 26 – 36], and deleting the computer programming language object in response to the terminating access [col. 8, lines 63 – 66].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Erickson to include the features of receiving a message from a service device and deleting the computer programming language object in response to the terminating access because this allows cleanup operations to be performed and afterwards selects the new application [col. 1, lines 49 – 63 of Baentsch], supports the maintenance of temporary objects between multiple invocations of an application during one session without using persistent memory and enables an application to ensure its integrity in case of an unexpected power down [col. 2, lines 47 – 57 of Baentsch].

7. As to claim 10, Erickson as modified teaches a method for the secure exchange of objects in a distributed computing environment [col. 25, line 57 – col. 26, line 14 of Erickson], comprising:

a user accessing a client device [col. 7, lines 1 – 16 of Erickson];

the client device receiving a message in a data representation language from a service device in the distributed computing environment [col. 7, lines 46 – 50 of Baentsch], wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of an object [XML format; col. 26, lines 15 – 20 of Erickson];

if the determining, determines the user has access rights to the computer programming language object [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 and col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 12 of Baentsch], generating the object from the data representation language representation of the object [a wrapper file has been created and stored, the wrapper file can be read by a wrapper builder application and deserialized, by known methods, to reproduce the objects that the wrapper comprises; col. 26, lines 20 – 30 of Erickson], wherein the object is an instance of a class in the computer programming language [wrapper builder application employs serialization to encode an internal object representation of a wrapper into XML format; col. 26, lines 16 – 20 of Erickson], and wherein the object is accessible for use during the accessing the client device [col. 25, line 59 - col. 26, line 13 of Erickson]; and

if the determining determines the user does not have access rights to the computer programming language object, not generating the object [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 and col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 12 of Baentsch].

8. As to claim 22, this is an apparatus claim that corresponds to method claim 1; note the rejection to claim 1 above, which also meet this apparatus claim.

9. As to claim 32, this is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 10; note the rejection to claim 10 above, which also meet this system claim.

10. As to claim 43, this is a product claim that corresponds to method claim 1; note the rejection to claim 1 above, which also meet this product claim.

11. As to claim 47, this is a product claim that corresponds to method claim 10; note the rejection to claim 10 above, which also meets this product claim.

12. As to claim 3, Erickson as modified teaches accessing a client device comprises the user coupling an identification device to the client device [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 of Baentsch], wherein the identification device provides identification information of the user to the client device [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 of Baentsch], and wherein the termination the accessing comprises decoupling the identification device from the client device [col. 8, lines 63 – 66 of Baentsch].

13. As to claim 4, Erickson as modified teaches the identification device is a smart card [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 of Baentsch].

14. As to claim 5, Erickson as modified teaches the accessing a client device comprises the user logging on to the client device [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 of Baentsch] by providing user identification to the client device [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 of Baentsch], and wherein the terminating the accessing comprises the user logging off the client device [col. 8, lines 63 – 66 of Baentsch].

15. As to claim 6, Erickson as modified teaches generating a computer programming language object from a data representation language representation of the object is performed by a virtual machine executing within the client device [col. 25, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson; examiner notes that a virtual machine is inherent to the Java environment].

16. As to claim 7, Erickson as modified teaches generating a plurality of computer programming language objects from data representation language representations of the objects [col. 25, line 59 - col. 26, line 13 of Erickson], and deleting the plurality of computer programming language objects in response to the terminating access [col. 8, lines 63 – 66 of Baentsch].

17. As to claim 8, Erickson as modified teaches the data representation language is extensible Markup Language (XML) [XML; col. 25, line 59 – col. 26, line 13 of Erickson].

18. As to claim 9, Erickson as modified teaches the computer programming language is the Java programming language [col. 25, line 59 – col. 26, line 13 of Erickson].

19. As to claim 11, Erickson as modified teaches the message further includes access information for the computer programming language object, wherein the determining if the user has access rights to the computer programming language object uses the access information [col. 6, lines 45 – 57 of Baentsch].

20. As to claim 12, Erickson as modified teaches deleting the computer programming language object in response to the user terminating access to the client device, wherein the deleted object is not accessible for use by subsequent users of the client device [col. 8, lines 63 – 66 of Baentsch].

21. As to claims 13 – 15, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3 – 5 above.

22. As to claim 16, Erickson as modified teaches the user terminating the accessing the client device and storing the computer programming language object in response to the terminating access [col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 4 of Baentsch].

23. As to claim 17, Erickson as modified teaches the user accessing the client device subsequent to the storing the object and accessing the stored object during the accessing the client device [col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 4 of Baentsch].

24. As to claim 18, Erickson as modified teaches storing access rights information of the user with the object, wherein the accessing the stored object comprises verifying the access rights of the user with the stored access rights information [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 and col. 7, line 65 – col. 8, line 12 of Baentsch].

25. As to claims 19 – 21, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6, 8 and 9 above.

26. As to claims 24 and 25, these are apparatus claims that correspond to method claims 3 and 4; note the rejections to claims 3 and 4 above, which also meet these apparatus claims.

27. As to claim 26, Erickson as modified teaches the device is further configured to accept user input to initiate the terminating the user access [col. 8, lines 63 – 66 of Baentsch].

28. As to claim 27, this is rejected for the same reason as claim 7 above.

29. As to claim 28, Erickson as modified teaches a processor, a memory [host computer 1404; col. 26, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson], and a virtual machine executed by the processor from the memory, wherein the generating is performed by the virtual machine [col. 25, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson; examiner notes that a virtual machine is inherent to the Java environment].

30. As to claim 29, Erickson as modified teaches the accepting, the terminating, and the deleting are performed by the virtual machine [col. 25, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson], wherein the object is stored in the memory subsequent to the generating, and wherein, in the deleting, the object is deleted from the memory [col. 8, lines 63 – 66 of Baentsch].

31. As to claims 30 and 31, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8 and 9 above.

32. As to claims 33 – 34, these are system claims that correspond to method claims 11 – 12; note the rejections to claims 11 – 12 above, which also meet these system claims.

33. As to claims 35 and 36, these are system claims that correspond to method claims 13 and 14; note the rejections to claims 13 and 14 above, which also meet these system claims.

34. As to claim 37, Erickson as modified teaches a memory [col. 26, lines 58 – 67 of Erickson], accept user input [col. 6, lines 56 – 67 of Baentsch] to terminate the access of the client device [col. 8, lines 63 – 66 of Baentsch], and store the computer programming language object to the memory in response to the terminating access [col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 4 of Baentsch].

35. As to claims 38 and 39, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 18 above.

36. As to claim 40, this is rejected for the same reasons as claim 28 above.

37. As to claims 41 and 42, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 8 and 9 above.

38. As to claim 45, this is rejected for the same reason as claim 7 above.

39. As to claim 46, this is rejected for the same reasons as claims 8 and 9 above.

40. As to claims 48 – 49, these are product claims that correspond to method claims 11 – 12; note the rejections to claims 11 – 12 above, which also meet these product claims.

41. As to claim 50, this is a product claim that corresponds to method claim 13; note the rejection to claim 13 above, which also meet these product claims.

42. As to claims 51 and 52, these are rejected for the same reasons as claims 16 – 18 above.

43. As to claim 53, Erickson as modified teaches the data representation language is eXtensible Markup Language (XML) [col. 25, lines 57-67 of Erickson] and the computer programming language is the Java programming language [col. 26, lines 1-16 of Erickson].

Conclusion

44. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"Secure Object Sharing in Java Card" discloses an object sharing mechanism in the Java Card.

U.S. Patent No. 6,256,690 to Carper discloses a system for facilitating the operation of multiple applications on a smart card.

U.S. Patent No. 6,754,886 to Merk et al. discloses storing Java objects in devices.

U.S. Patent No. 6,195,700 to Bender et al. discloses an application protocol data unit management facility.

CONTACT INFORMATION

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

LBZ

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER